



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 99/20

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
City Hall  
600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room  
Wednesday February 5, 2020 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Manish Chalana  
Roi Chang  
Russell Coney  
Matt Inpanbutr  
Jordon Kiel  
Kristen Johnson  
Ian Macleod  
Harriet Wasserman

### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

### **020520.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

November 6, 2019

MM/SC/11/6/19 6:2:0 Minutes approved. Ms. Chang and Mr. Inpanbutr abstained.

### **020520.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

020520.21 Columbia City Landmark District  
Multiple locations within the right-of-way  
Proposed bike racks

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation and replacement of bike racks and bike corrals in locations throughout the District. Exhibits included plans, photographs and specifications. The Committee received a project briefing in Jan. 2018. On January 7, 2020 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee discussed orientation and placement of the racks and recommended some minor modifications. Following a presentation by the applicant and Committee discussion, the Committee recommended approval for the installation of bike racks and corrals, with the recommended modifications. SDOT submitted updated plans that reflect the CCRC's recommendations.

Applicant Comment:

Lucien Ong, SDOT, proposed installation of 78 new enhanced design bike racks, 15 at new locations and 25 to replace existing rack; three racks will be removed. He said the design is the one that was approved by CCRC. He said it is stainless steel on sides with rubber in middle so not to scratch bikes. He said attachment will be into the mortar to prevent breakage of bricks. He identified corral (three racks in a group) locations.

Ms. Barker asked how the rubber wears over time.

Jonathan Frazier, SDOT, said it is sansoprene which has a life of 25-30 years; the durability is longer than concrete.

Ms. Barker asked about graffiti removal.

Mr. Frazier said there is none that he is aware of but said he imagined it would be SDOT responsibility. He said it hasn't been a problem in other locations.

Mr. Coney asked if placement allows clearance for parking.

Mr. Ong said they are sited 2' from the edge and won't be impacted by cars.

Ms. Frestedt said the CCRC reviewed and supported the proposal.

Mr. Macleod supported the application and noted the need. He appreciated the nicer racks.

Ms. Johnson supported the application and appreciated the rack style.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of bike racks and corrals, as proposed

This action is based on the following:

The proposed work meets the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

Guidelines/Specific

7. Street Use. Any work that affects a street, alley, sidewalk or other public right-of-way, shall be reviewed by the Review Committee and Board. Emphasis shall be placed on creating and maintaining pedestrian-oriented public spaces and rights-of-way. Street trees and other plant materials that add human enjoyment to the District shall be encouraged. Decorative treatments within the sidewalk, including special paving patterns and building entryway tiling shall be preserved. The use of alleys for services and public-oriented activities shall be encouraged.

Secretary of the Interior Standards

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/DB/RC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

020520.22 Medical-Dental Building  
509 Olive Way  
Proposed signage

Ms. Sodt presented on behalf of the applicant because it was simple; ARC reviewed. The faces of existing signs will be changed, with colors flipping. There is no change to attachment.

Ms. Wasserman said it looked fine.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage alterations at the Medical Dental Building, 509 Olive Way, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 122316, as the proposed work is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RC/KJ 8:0:0 Motion carried.

020520.23 Troy Laundry Building  
311-329 Fairview Avenue North  
Proposed signage.

Ms. Sodt explained the proposal is to apply vinyl lettering to outside; it will hold up well and is removable. She said the other sign for the business was previously approved. The same font will be used; business has a logo, a man drinking coffee.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage alterations at the Troy Laundry Building, 311 Fairview Avenue North, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 118047, as the proposed work is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/IM/KJ      8:0:0    Motion carried.

*Mr. Chalana arrived at 3:50pm.*

020520.24 Federal Reserve Bank  
1015 Second Avenue  
Proposed rooftop alterations

Ms. Sodt said there is already an approval in for a larger project at this site.

Erik Mott, Perkins + Will said the revision is a minor one, driven by tenant request. He said hatches with ladders were approved for the roof but they propose to install stairs and a hydraulic elevator to meet ADA, within a single penthouse for clean lines. It is 6' taller because of the stairs and elevator. He provided virtual views showing the entire volume and noted visibility of the new structure is minimal. He said the penthouse is similar to those at Maritime and Macy buildings.

Ms. Barker asked if the building to the west is taller and what they think.

Mr. Mott said the neighbors are aware.

Ms. Barker said they came to a meeting.

Ms. Sodt said no public comment has been received.

Mr. Mott said now it is a rooftop deck.

Mr. Kiel said it will look better.

Ms. Barker asked if they planned on having pavers, vegetation.

Mr. Mott said no vegetation, but pavers are planned.

Mr. Kiel said a little more is visible, but it is a non-issue.

Ms. Johnson asked if there will be a guard rail.

Mr. Mott said yes and that it will be minimal - vertical steel with horizontal cable, rail with metal top plate. Rail is at edge of pavers.

Ms. Sodt said if they add a canopy structure it would have to come back for review.

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary said they have had long conversation and the neighbors were more concerned with the 50-story building. He said they brought height down and haven't heard concerns. He said they hadn't done additional outreach about roof penthouse.

Ms. Sodt said neighbors are on Landmarks email list and get agendas.

Tom Bartholomew said the contractor meets with sub-group of homeowners group.

Mr. McCullough said he would schedule a tour for ARC.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed rooftop alterations at the Federal Reserve Bank, 1015 Second Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed rooftop alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified the Report on Designation, as the proposed work is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RC/KJ 9:0:0 Motion carried.

020520.25 Bon Marche Building  
300 Pine Street  
Proposed street level alterations

Jack McCullough said Starwood Capital took over the building; Amazon occupies the top six floors. He said there will be retail on the first floor and entertainment. He said what is requested has been done before; there was one tenant on the first floor and now there will be multiple.

Steve Lawson, CallisonRTKL proposed replacing non-original exterior doors. He noted deferred maintenance on window trim. He said they will do a complete inventory of exterior window trim.

Mr. McCullough said they found some trim in the building.

Mr. Lawson said there is not enough to use but there is enough to have someone replicate it. He said bronze is proposed and will be based on the existing pattern. He said they will keep and repair where possible. He said for the marquee's pressed metal fascia, the contractor has identified a source to provide replacement pieces. They will fix damage where shown. He said it is sheets of pressed metal, not molded.

Mr. McCullough said Macy's was supposed to install lighting under the skybridge.

Mr. Lawson said they will finish what Macy's did not. He said the building is single ownership now, so it is easier. He said the existing exterior doors were installed in the 1990s; the replacement door has a larger bottom piece. He said the existing individual door leaves are not wide enough to be code compliant. He said the proposed doors are wider which allows proper egress. They are working with the same overall opening. He said the door at the building corner will be removed to restore the original condition with no door. He said the new door solution is the same at all entry points around the perimeter.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked if the trim replacement will match the rest; he asked if existing will be cleaned to there is not a patchwork affect.

Mr. Lawson said the whole window will match.

Mr. Chalana asked if smaller retail spaces will impact entries.

Mr. McCullough said they will all use the same; they will reverse engineer the planning.

Mr. Macleod asked about subway windows.

Mr. Lawson said the trim will match the rest.

Mr. Kiel said ARC reviewed and found the proposal reasonable. Replacement is in-kind and very custom.

Mr. Coney asked if they would create extra trim for the future. He asked about relief around elevator.

Mr. McCullough said they received guidance form ARC and they will keep it. He said the elevator may not be in use.

Mr. Coney asked about the bas relief on elevator.

Paul Brenneke said it is fairly new, not historic; Macy's is taking it with them.

Mr. Kiel said it is not controlled.

Mr. Chalana asked about the sign.

Mr. McCullough said it will stay for a while.

Ms. Sodt said the Bon Marche signs are landmarked and will not be removed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations at the Bon Marche Building, 300 Pine Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 114772, as the proposed work is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/HW/DB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. McCullough thanked the board for allowing the roof deck; the decision has supported \$200 million in improvements.

**020520.3      DESIGNATION**

020520.31      Avon Apartments / Capitol Crest Apartments  
825 East Denny Way / 1831-35 Broadway Avenue

Owner representative, George Ma read a letter (in DON file) asking the board not to designate.

Complete report in DON file.

David Peterson, Historic Resource Consulting provided context of the neighborhood and site.

Susan Boyle, BOLA Architecture + Planning provided an overview of the history of the neighborhood. She stated that Capitol Hill was developed in response to transit. She noted the close proximity to infrastructure between retail, residential, and institutional.

Mr. Peterson said that the subject building was constructed in 1905 for real estate investors Ahrens & Kimball as a mixed-use structure, with two stories of apartments over first floor commercial spaces. The building is located at the southwest corner of Broadway Avenue and East Denny Way. The building is three stories of wood-frame brick veneer construction over a concrete basement, with a flat, built-up roof wrapped by a tall parapet with a deep projecting wood cornice on the street-facing façades. The structure is built to the property line at the street corner and shares the parcel with an accessory surface parking lot located on the west side. Although the brick façades have been painted (a non-original condition), the street-facing north and east façades feature face brick, while the rear or west façade is clad with common brick. Between the first and second floors, a wood horizontal trim board wraps the two street façades.

The building is notable for a total of six two-story chamfered-corner bay windows which extend the full height of the second and third floors, engaging the cornice—two bays each at the two street-facing façades (north and east), as well as the parking lot façade (west). All windows in the building are non-original—vinyl single-hung sash replacements of the original wood double-hung sash at the upper floors, installed at some time after 1989.

The projecting window bays are wood frame with painted wood and sheet metal cladding, and wood trim. Upper-story window openings in the masonry veneer wall are typically grouped into pairs, and feature rough-dressed painted stone sills at the street-facing north and east façades, but plainer smooth-faced painted sills (possibly cast stone or concrete) at the rear or west façade.

Windows are ornamented with flat arch headers at the north and west façades, and simple projecting brick decorative hoods at the north and east façades.

When originally constructed, there was a recessed porch between the bay windows on the Broadway Avenue façade, which is visible in historic photographs. At the second story, the porch featured a wood railing in plane with the exterior wall, while at the third story, there was a projecting balcony and railing supported by two end brackets. The recess apparently served as a fire escape, as a fire ladder is visible in the 1937 tax assessor photograph. Although the recessed balcony was enclosed during 1972 alterations updating the building's fire stairs and exits, the projecting balcony was not removed until sometime between 2008 and 2011. Today, this recess in the façade is clad with painted plywood panels and wood trim. The rear or west façade may have also featured a similar stacked, recessed pair of balconies when originally constructed, as evidenced by an apparently non-original vertical wood infill panel which extends between the second and third floors, between the two bay windows. The vertical panel is constructed of painted plywood with wood trim, and features paired, contemporary vinyl sash windows at each floor. However, there are no historic photographs or drawings showing the original condition of the rear of the building to confirm this.

Ms. Boyle said at the north and south ends of the east or Broadway Avenue façade, there are two street-level storefronts which are divided by a length of non-original masonry wall with a recessed entry for the south commercial space. The northeast corner storefront wraps around to the East Denny Way façade to the depth of one window bay. Above, a steel and glass marquee installed around 1989 covers the sidewalk. These storefronts are not original, and they have been completely and repeatedly altered over time; at present they are stick-built bronze aluminum glazing. Historic tax records and photographs indicate that the original condition featured three fully glazed wood storefronts on wood bulkheads, with copper trim sash, each with recessed entries, and a continuous transom above; all of this was removed by the mid-1950s.

Mr. Peterson said the whole storefront character has changed. He noted comparable apartment buildings – Lorraine Court, Chalmers, Fredonia, and the Chester.

Ms. Boyle said comparable mixed-use buildings include 201 Summit Avenue East, Casa Del Ray, Roe Apartments and said that a number of comparable buildings remain. She said the typology is everywhere.

Mr. Peterson said the Avon wasn't the oldest mixed-use building and noted the Wilshire Lota Building which was built in 1903. It has a remarkable level of detail; it retains its bulkheads, transoms and still has shop window.

Ms. Boyle said there are many Seattle-centric buildings: Moana, Hilcrest, Sherbrook, Thomas Park View, Glencoe, Uptowner, and Summit Arms.

Mr. Peterson commented the Uptown is a brick building that has been nicely remodeled. He said architect William White, a prolific designer in pre-World War I Seattle who designed a wide range of building types but specialized in apartment houses. White's designs frequently employed restrained Neoclassical styling. Local buildings by White include the Renton, Imperial, Olympian, Palladian, and Sagamore among others. He said this building does not meet any criteria for designation. He said the building lacked integrity noting the loss of storefronts and recessed portion and balcony.

Ms. Boyle said people wished the balcony was there. She said one expects to see changes in a building this age but it is a matter of degree.

Mr. Coney asked about the restaurant tenant, Anna Purna.

Mr. Ma said it has been there a while.

Public Comment:

Tom Heuser, Capitol Hill Historical Society supported designation on criteria D and F. He said there is enough visible character – the cornice, bay windows, recesses, oak panel wainscoting, tile floor at entry. He said the building was constructed in 1905 and is one of a few remaining pre-1910 and pre-auto row buildings. He said it is a prominent intersection and is next to light rail station. It is easily identifiable.

Lana Blinderman said she is a Capitol Hill resident and supported designation, noting the building is visually significant; it is one of few of its kind left. The building is significant to the community noting the location and the restaurant.

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle supported designation. He said the building adds to the character of the neighborhood. It is one of a few buildings this age in the neighborhood and it contrasts with what is around it. He said it is a mixed-use building in the earliest city neighborhood. He said there have been alterations, but in working class neighborhood those spaces change. He said storefronts are now reverting to original look. He noted the corner column being prominent and its form and design are recognizable from the east. He noted the bays and strong cornice. He said the building has integrity in form, material and design.

Mr. Coney supported designation and said the building is important to the neighborhood. He said examples given in presentation are not in the neighborhood except for this building, Casa Del Ray and Wilshire; there are no others. He read from Criterion D "it embodies...". He said window

openings, tile entry, brick veneer, band between first and second floors, stone sills have not changed. He said the infill of openings is unfortunate, but they are still there. Commercial openings are still roughly the same. He said the building is identifiable in the neighborhood and contributes to the neighborhood. He said this building needs to be saved and there has been a loss of historic character when light rail built; this is one of final remaining.

Ms. Chang appreciated the follow-up information. She said a brick veneer is not a bearing wall. She said she was 'on the fence' about Criterion D because of Seattle-centric Style. She said after reading public comment she thought more about Criterion F. She said the location next to light rail makes it more distinct in character and spatial location.

Mr. Chalana supported designation. He said the integrity of form and design is there although there are some issues with materiality. He said all openings are there. Everything on Broadway is rapidly changing and is losing the richness that comes from layering of fabric and that sense of time. He said the building is valued by the community. He noted criteria D and F as relevant.

Mr. Macleod supported designation based on criteria D and F. He said Criterion F is the most difficult to academically justify. He said the building is part of a greater fabric that is mostly lost that makes a case for Criterion F strong. He said the architecture is more intact than lost, and can still be read. He said the neighborhood context is Broadway – a major corridor and this is a distinctive building.

Ms. Johnson did not support designation due to integrity issues. She said Criterion F made her think twice – it is distinct from what is around it.

Mr. Inpanbutr did not support designation noting integrity issues.

Ms. Wasserman said she thought the building had changed too much, but has changed her mind. She said it meets Criterion F as it really stands out in the neighborhood.

Ms. Barker supported designation specifically for floors two and three. She said there have been so many changes to the ground floor. She said it meets Criterion F because it is distinctive in scale and it is still representative of the neighborhood. She said thankfully it has its cornice.

Mr. Kiel did not support designation noting it did not rise to the level of landmark status. He said it was close, but not there. Regarding Criterion F is it easily identifiable because of its tenant. The building fades into the background. He noted loss of integrity.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Avon / Capitol Crest Apartments at 825 E Denny Way / 1831-35 Broadway Avenue, as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the building exterior.

MM/SC/RC/DB 6:3:0 Motion carried. Messrs. Kiel and Inpanbutr, and Ms. Johnson opposed.

**020520.4 NOMINATION**

020520.41 Nickel Apartments / Villa Camini  
1205 NE 42<sup>nd</sup> Street

Nick Afsah, Greystar Development explained the acquired the building along with four others nearby, and the plan for adjacent development. He said they plan to preserve the building and are therefore seeking nomination. He said there is lots of enthusiasm from the community. He said they want to use the TDR program.

Nomination report in DON file.

Susan Boyle, BOLA Architecture + Planning provided context of the site and neighborhood. She provided history of the neighborhood which grew in parallel with the growth of the University of Washington. She said more and more apartment buildings were constructed in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. As the campus expanded south and west the district changed – a major boulevard and larger buildings.

She said the building was built in 1924 by Williams Coles. She said the building looks more like a big house. Adeline Nickels purchased the building; she was a socialite who taught school. She was the daughter of a successful businessman. She said ownership has turned over through the years. She said there are no original plans. She said the apartments are large, occupied by single people and couples; there were few children. She said tenants were middle class professional people. She said they started renting to students and the interiors changed to accommodate. She said the exterior is intact. The interior of the building has been remodeled over time and she noted an interior stair was changed to incorporate the space into bedrooms.

She said the building was designed by Earl Roberts in a Mediterranean Eclectic / Revival style. She said there are very few examples in Seattle, and she noted the unique appearance of this building. She said it is almost Prairie style. Roberts' early work includes the 1916-1918 Lake View School, a small wood frame building with a classical portico, which was listed on the National

Register in 1988; and the 1921 Classical style Fifth Church of Christ, Scientist in Seattle's Columbia City Historic District, (Rainier Valleys Cultural Center).

She said the building has integrity; it retains its stucco, chimneys are prominent. She noted the portico entry and divided sash windows. She said the south façade is utilitarian. She said the building doesn't meet Criterion C but does meet D; she said it is unique and has character and it atypical for a multi-family dwelling. She said the building meets Criterion F. It is close to the commercial center is noticeable with its longitudinal façade. She said the building is not an outstanding work of Roberts'.

Ms. Johnson said it looks like a house, like Anhalt buildings and asked if that is unusual.

Ms. Boyle said it is.

Mr. Coney asked if the stucco was original.

Ms. Boyle said it is.

Ms. Chang asked if it is masonry wall construction.

Ms. Boyle said she didn't know if it was hollow clay tile or what, but that she would investigate.

Ms. Doherty said the walls look too thin to be load bearing masonry.

Ms. Boyle said it is probably applied.

Mr. Chalana asked the number of apartments.

Ms. Boyle said there are seven.

Ms. Doherty said the tax records note the building construction as "concrete above 2 x 6 stud walls - ordinary masonry and frame".

Mr. Coney asked the number of fireplaces.

Ms. Boyle said one basement apartment is operating as office space.

Public Comment:

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle supported nomination. He said it is straightforward. The building is an amalgamation of style and has been well-stewarded. He said he was excited to see that the owner will utilize TDR and

incentives. It is a great example of how to do great preservation in a rapidly changing environment.

Ms. Boyle said they met with the University District Community Council who was supportive.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Barker supported designation and said she was excited to see TDR in use. She said criteria D and F and maybe E were relevant. She said it is unusual and different from Roberts' other building. She discouraged adding a rooftop addition and didn't want to see another Franklin Apartments.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination and said the building reminds her of Bleitz Funeral Home. She said the building adds to the character of the neighborhood. She said TDR is a good benefit to the new development. She supported nomination of site and exterior on criteria D and F.

Ms. Macleod supported nomination noting criteria D and F, and E if more information is provided.

Mr. Inpanbutr supported nomination on criteria D and F.

Ms. Chang supported nomination on criteria D and wants to know more about the exterior wall construction.

Mr. Coney supported nomination on criteria D and F. He said he was glad to hear about use of TDR, and wished it was available on Capitol Hill.

Ms. Wasserman supported nomination of site and exterior on criteria D and F. She said it was nice to see so much intact.

Mr. Chalana supported nomination on criteria D and F.

Mr. Kiel supported nomination and said it is remarkably preserved at the exterior.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Villa Camini / Nickel Apartments at 1205 NE 42<sup>nd</sup> Street for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site, and the building exterior; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for March 18, 2020; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/ROC/RC 9:0:0 Motion carried.

**020520.5 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator